



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/505,392	08/20/2004	Peter J Dronzek JR.	181-037	7246
47888 7590 05/04/2009 HEDMAN & COSTIGAN P.C. 1185 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK, NY 10036				
EXAMINER				
CHANG, VICTOR S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1794				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/04/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/505,392

Applicant(s)

DRONZEK ET AL.

Examiner

VICTOR S. CHANG

Art Unit

1794

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 February 2009.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-6 and 8-53 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 12-53 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-6, 8-11 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Introduction

1. Applicants' amendments and remarks filed on 2/17/2009 have been entered. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 1, 3-6 and 8-11 are active.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. In response to the amendment, the grounds of rejection have been rewritten as set forth below.

Rejections Based on Prior Art

4. Claims 1, 3-6 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fischer [US 6328340] in view of Hoffman [US 4879430] and evidenced by Caputo et al. [US 4840270].

Fischer's invention relates to a form having a detachable (removable) card. Fig. 1 shows a form sheet 1 of paper and a piece of a substrate material 2. The substrate 2 further comprises a substrate layer 21 (layer (iv) of the claimed invention), a peeling adhesive layer 22, an outer layer 23 (layer (iii) of the claimed invention), and a permanent pressure-sensitive adhesive layer 24. The substrate 2 is adhered to the lower surface of form 1 by means of the permanent pressure-sensitive adhesive layer 24. A piece of a covering material 4, which comprises an outer layer 41 and a permanent pressure-sensitive adhesive layer 42, is provided on the front of the form. The outer layers 23 and 41 are transparent plastic films, such as polyester films [col. 4,

lines 46-57]. A punching (die cut) runs all the way through the layers 41, 42, 1, 24, 23 and 22 and reaching down as far as the substrate layer 21 [col. 4, line 62 through col. 5, line 5]. During detaching of the card 3, the peeling adhesive 22 is completely detached from the substrate layer 21 and stays with the card. The peeling adhesive layer 22 has a non-permanent adhesive effect with respect to the substrate 21 and a permanent adhesive effect with respect to the outer layer 23 [col. 5, lines 12-16]. The different adhesive effects with respect to the substrate layer 21 and the outer layer 23 can be achieved by a suitable process control and/or different pretreatment of the surfaces of the layers 21 and 23 [col. 3, lines 28-36]. The detachment from the substrate material 21 has caused layer 22 to lose its stickiness, so that the card 3 is not self-adhesive, and the no longer sticky peeling adhesive layer can be written or printed [col. 5, lines 19-22].

For claims 1, 5 and 8-11, Fischer teaches all the features of the claimed invention, except for being silent about 1) the surface treatments on the upper surface of substrate layer 21 (layer (iv) of the claimed invention) and lower surface of outer layer 23 (layer (iii) of the claimed invention) are characterized by differential treatment patterns of treated area and non-treated area, 2) the percentage of treated area. However, regarding item 1), Hoffman's invention relates to a web of plastic wherein one surface layer thereof has been subjected to selective pattern of corona discharge treatment (differentially treated). This pattern is characterized by selective corona discharge treatment in some areas. The pattern has relatively small repeating units [col. 2, ll. 35-41]. The selective surface treatment pattern can be used to enhance the increased bond strengths achieved in the heat sealed regions [col. 3, ll. 27-35]. In contrast to uniformly corona treated plastic surface, the interruption of the selective surface treatment pattern acts as a

mechanism to encourage a maximum release of highly proteinaceous material from the treated surface [col. 3, ll. 67 through col. 4, ll. 5]. Figs. 1-4 illustrate various useful treatment patterns. Further, it is well known that the level of corona treatment affects its bond strength to pressure sensitive adhesive, as evidenced by Table 2 of Caputo reference relating to a resealable label flap. Since Fischer teaches that the different adhesive effects with respect to the substrate layer 21 and the outer layer 23 can be achieved by a suitable process control and/or different pretreatment of the surfaces of the layers 21 and 23, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of surface treatment to modify Fischer with the selective corona surface pattern treatment of Hoffman, because the selection of a known material based on its suitability for its intended use supported a *prima facie* obviousness determination, and motivated by the desire to obtain an improved releasability of the detachable card for end use. Regarding item 2), since the collective teachings of prior art render the general structure and composition obvious, a workable percentage of treated area over the surface to achieve the required adhesiveness or releasability is deemed to be an obvious routine optimization to one skilled in the art, motivated by the desire to obtain the required level of beneficial effects for the same end use as the claimed invention.

For claims 3 and 4, Fischer is silent about the thickness of polyester film layer and the weight basis of the paper stock. However, since Fischer teaches the generally same subject matter for the same use (detachable card intermediate) as the instant invention, a workable thickness of polyester film and weight basis of paper stock are deemed to be either anticipated by Fischer, or obvious routine optimizations to one skilled in the art of detachable card intermediate, motivated to obtain required card physical properties for the same use.

For claim 6, Fischer is silent about the amount of difference in adhesion. However, since Fischer teaches the generally same subject matter for the same use as the instant invention, a workable difference in adhesion for achieving different adhesive effects is deemed to be either anticipated by Fischer, or obvious routine optimizations to one skilled in the art of detachable card intermediate, motivated to easily detach the card for the same end use as the claimed invention.

Response to Argument

5. Applicants argue at Remarks page 12:

“Fischer relied upon a peelable adhesive that is transferred to the card as the card is removed. Since the peelable adhesive is transferred to and stays on the back of removable card, it causes the removed card to stick to other cards which is a distinct disadvantage.”

However, applicants’ argument ignores Fischer’s teaching that the detachment from the substrate material 21 has caused layer 22 to lose its stickiness, so that the card 3 is not self-adhesive. Further, applicants are reminded that since Interface B is separable, the peelable adhesive layer of the claimed invention is transferred to and stays on the back of the removable card of the claimed invention as well.

Applicants’ arguments at page 13 directed to Fischer individually ignore that the grounds of rejections are based on the collective teachings of prior art as set forth above.

Finally, since the structural features of Caputo are withdrawn, applicants’ arguments at pages 13-15 are moot.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VICTOR S. CHANG whose telephone number is (571)272-1474. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 am - 5:00 pm, Tuesday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye can be reached on 571-272-3186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Victor S Chang/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794